UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes **Francis Neilson**

Patriotism

By JESSE H. HOLMES

Abdul Baha

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Some Causes of Present-Day Unrest

By A. W. LITTLEFIELD

VOLUME LXXXVIII NUMBER 14

Chicago, December 15, 1921

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

A Journal of the Religion of Democracy

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES : *Editors* : FRANCIS NEILSON

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
HENRY R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ANNA GARLIN SPENCER
SIDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCES L. ROBERTS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

CANADA—Sidney Snow
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
E. D. Morel
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch
(*To be enlarged*)

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

UNITY Fellowship Associates

BOND OF UNION

We, the undersigned, believing in the association of all men and women who are in sympathy with the aims and ideals set forth in the Announcement printed November 3rd, 1921, do invite all who wish to co-operate to join in a world-wide fellowship that has no bounds of race or creed.

The name of this fellowship is The Unity Fellowship Associates and its purpose is the interpretation of the Religion of Democracy. Membership means a declaration of sympathy and interest. There are no dues. Members may make voluntary contributions which will be used for the purpose of making known the aims of the Fellowship and the publication of its literature.

UNITY will be the organ of this Fellowship and all members will be requested, though not compelled, to be subscribers.

Lists of the members will be sent to all members so that they may be known to one another. Local groups may be formed wherever there exists a sufficient number and there is the desire to do so.

All persons who desire to become members may do so by sending their names to UNITY, care of Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago, Ill.

Name .....

Address .....

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

To UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY,
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago.

Gentlemen:

Enclosed you will find check for which please enter my subscription to UNITY for one year.

Mr. (Mrs. or Miss)_____

Address _____

Rates: $3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription. Single copies 10 cents.

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 211
Patriotism.—JESSE H. HOLMES..... 213
Abdul Baha.—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES..... 215

ARTICLES—

The Wisdom of the Peoples.—*Selected by James Waldo Fawcett*..... 216
Some Causes of Present-Day Unrest.—REV. A. W. LITTLEFIELD..... 217
Concerning Prisons and Punishments.—BRENT DOW ALLINSON 219
The New Skepticism.—HUGH ROBERT ORR.... 221

THE STUDY TABLE—

New Books in Science.—FREDERICK STARR..... 221

POETRY—

How Wonderful Is Love.—*Florence Earle Coates* 211
A Hymn of Peace.—*Alvira Phelps Haagsma*.. 216
The Puzzled Game Birds.—*Thomas Hardy*.... 221

THE FIELD—

A Letter from Buda-Pest.—FRED HANKINSON. 223
Save the Russian Children!..... 223

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOL. LXXXVIII. THURSDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1921 NUMBER 14

HOW WONDERFUL IS LOVE.

How wonderful is love!—
  More wonderful, I wis,
Than cherry-blossoms are when Spring's first kiss
Warms the chill breast of earth
And gives new birth
To beauty! High above
All miracles the miracle of love,
Which by its own, glad and triumphant power
Brings life to flower.

Oh, love is wonderful!
More wonderful than is the dew-fed rose
Whose petals half unclose
  In welcome of the light,
When first the Dawn comes robed in vesture cool
  Of fragrant, shimmering white!
More wonderful and strange
Than moonrise, which doth change
Dulness to glory—
Yea, with a touch transforms the mountains hoary
  And fills the darkling rills with living silver bright!

Not music when it wings
From the far azure where the skylark sings
  Is wonderful as love!—
Not music when it wells
From the enchanted, fairy-haunted dells
  Where rose and thorn enshrine
A grief that dwells apart,
And from the life-blood of a breaking heart
The nightingale pours forth for ever
The rapture and the pain, that naught can sever,
  Of love, which mortal is, yet knows itself divine!

Harper's Magazine. —*Florence Earle Coates.*

Since Mr. Holmes and Mr. Neilson took charge of UNITY, following the death of Mr. Jones, the short editorial notes in each issue have been written by Mr. Holmes. Under the present organization of the UNITY FELLOWSHIP, Mr. Holmes will continue to contribute editorial notes regularly each week, but others will be printed as regularly from other members of the FELLOWSHIP. These notes, therefore, are now to be regarded very particularly by readers as the utterances of the paper, and not of any single individual.

EDITORS.

One of the elements which entered into the inspiration of the Washington Conference was undoubtedly an outgrowth of injured pride on the part of the American people. Somehow or other a sense had been developing among us that, for better or worse, we had been left out of something in which we ought to have been included. Everything had been going out and nothing coming in. We had been deprived, as Will Irwin says, in referring to the next war, of the "Good time" that "was had by all," at least so far as those tangible evidences such as devastated villages, barbed wire entanglements, and shell plowed fields were concerned. It was therefore necessary that something be done to transfer the center of the world's attention, far too long directed upon the continent of Europe, to its rightful and more worthy object. Our pride began to gain some measure of satisfaction when Marshal Foch arrived, entered upon his triumphant career to St. Louis and returned with a wild cat, a choice collection of corncob pipes, and 57 varieties of college degrees. We are still in a state of unsuppressed exaltation over the fact that Ambassadors Extraordinary and Ministers Plenipotentiary with ostrich plumes and golden jackets have been forced to come to Washington to visualize the glories of our state. Little by little, therefore, this sense of injured pride is being satisfied. If we could develop to the same degree a sense of pride in the accomplishment of a program of complete disarmament, the thing would be done, since pride is a highly dynamic force. It is at this point, however, where those who have pride in internationalism must step in to prevent the collapse of the most promising venture in modern times.

We have no desire to be impudent, but a very insistent desire to be honest. We are therefore trying only to be honest when we say that the newspaper correspondents in Washington who are covering the Conference for the Limitation of Armaments, are, with certain conspicuous and honorable exceptions, either liars or innocents. As these men are without exception the most experienced and eminent in their profession, it is difficult to believe that they are so virginally simple and naive as their despatches from day to day would seem to indicate. But if this supposition is inadmissable, then there is nothing to believe but that these correspondents are deliberately deceiving the people by telling them what is untrue, or, still better, hiding from them what is true. Think of the praise that was lavished on Briand's speech; was it for any other purpose than to conceal the fact that France had defied the Conference, and was making any effectual disarmament, either on land or sea, impossible? Note the failure day after day to report the perfectly obvious fact that Japan was stalling on the 5-5-3 ratio of naval strength for the three great powers, only in order to strike a hard bargain on China and Siberia. Worst of all, take the flood of "slobber" that was poured out over the willingness of England, France and Japan to cancel certain leases of Chinese territory, when these nations were making it plain all the while

that they had not the slightest intention of surrendering territory, such as Hong-Kong and Port Arthur, which was really valuable. Such treatment of the facts is propaganda, pure and simple; and propaganda, as we have long since learned, is a long word for *"lies."* The newspaper work in this conference has thus far been an out-and-out disgrace!

Whatever the outcome of the Washington Conference, one cannot fail to have noted with sinking heart the atmosphere in which its discussions have been conducted, the point of view from which all its arguments have started. In everything that has been said and done, war has been taken for granted as a recognized and respectable institution of social life. Why are great navies maintained on any ratio—5-5-3, or 10-10-7, or any other—except as a necessary provision *for war?* Why does Japan insist upon the 10-10-7 relationship, if not because she regards this as the minimum of safety *in war?* Why does Great Britain seek the scrapping of submarines as well as dreadnaughts, if not because she fears blockade *in the next war?* France refuses to consider land disarmament in Europe, in view of *the coming war* with Germany. *War,* in other words, is accepted by all nations as the one contingency to which all changes and arrangements must be adjusted. It never seems to occur to anybody that peace may also be a contingency; and that if international policies were determined by the latter rather than the former, amazing results might follow. The fact of the matter is, our world is a war world. Its politics are the politics of war, its economics the economics of war, its ideals the ideals of war. Even its religion is a worship of the War God. So long as such condition exists, no matter what conferences may do, wars and rumors of wars will still be with us!

What we need, in this whole business of war and peace, is a change of front. We need to establish a code of international law and a system of international government which will *outlaw war* between nations as effectually as violence between individuals is now outlawed. This means formal agreement that all disputes between nations shall be settled by due process of law, in courts established for the purpose; and that any nation resisting or defying such process, and resorting to force under any circumstances, shall be deemed a criminal and dealt with accordingly. A declaration of war, in other words, or any act of war, duly defined in the code, would be regarded as an offence against the peace and order of the world. It is strange that we cannot see that the precedent for all this is before us in the case of duelling. A war is only a duel between nations, that is all; and the mechanism of riddance may be, indeed must be, the same in both cases. For war, like duelling, serves a purpose, so long as no substitute is provided. As things stand today, it is the one legal and approved means of settling disputes between nations in a case of last resort. Our task now is to make it an illegal and condemned means of effecting this end, and to substitute therefor a "due process" method. This done, our problem will be solved! When courts and law were established in domestic society, duelling straightway disappeared. It no longer served any purpose, it became a public nuisance, was labeled a crime, and by process of outlawry was thus abolished. The same thing will happen to war any time we make up our minds really to get rid of it.

It is evident that affairs in India are approaching a crisis. On the one hand, the "Non-Co-operation" movement is working out to its logical and therefore revolutionary conclusion. Thus it is now no longer a question of refusing to accept English titles of honor, of taking children out of schools, and of boycotting cotton cloth; Gandhi is today urging his followers to pay no taxes, and his Mohammedan colleagues, the Ali brothers, are in prison for urging Mohammedan soldiers to desert the English army. On the other hand, the Empire, altogether baffled by Gandhi's unfamiliar and highly successful non-resistant methods, has evidently decided at last to adopt a policy of deliberate repression. Thus, the punishment of the Ali brothers has been followed by the arrest on sedition charges of Lajpat Rai, an eminent Indian scholar and publicist, well-known in this country, and a disciple of Mahatma Gandhi. Public meetings are being forbidden and dispersed with increasing frequency. As a climax, and a certain indication of official temper, comes the news that the All-India Congress, scheduled to assemble this month, will not be allowed to be held. All this is ominous; the advocates of violent rebellion are already beginning to talk about bloodshed, safe-conduct for Americans, etc., as though this were not the very thing that the English want. For the Indians have about as much chance of securing independence from the British Crown by force of arms, as they have of detaching the peninsula from the mainland and making it an island of the sea. If England can only make them fight, their cause is doomed. Gandhi's movement is the only way out. The very policy of repression now adopted by the authorities is the proof of its terrible effectiveness and ultimate success. Can Gandhi, in the face of deliberate persecution, make his people see this, and endure to the end? His critical hour is unquestionably at hand.

Here's a pretty howdy-do! A court issuing injunctions not against strikers but against *employers!* For months past capital has been rushing to the courts on every occasion of a dispute with labor, and with an ease which has been paralyzing, has been securing injunctions which have made striking one of the de-

cidedly extra-hazardous occupations of our day. So common has this process become of late, that some of us were beginning to feel that courts existed not primarily to interpret law or punish crime, but to break strikes; and that labor was facing the grim possibility of being obliged to begin all over again that fight for the right to strike which was initiated more than eighty years ago. Now comes a new kind of injunction, which proves most unexpectedly that there are two sides to this shield. On plea of counsel for the striking garment-workers in New York, Judge Guy issues an order, which he refuses to vacate or amend, directing the manufacturers to live up to their agreement with the unions, violation of which precipitated the strike. The court is using its authority, in other words, to force the manufacturers to keep their contracts with their workers.

"This case," says Mr. Samuel Untermeyer, "squarely presents the issue of whether the law which has proved itself strong enough to curb and punish unlawful activities of labor unions, will also prove strong enough to protect the unions against unlawful acts of the employers."

We welcome this as a happy turn in the wheel of fortune. We have serious doubts as to whether the injunction process should ever be used in cases of this kind. It marks an extension of judicial power which seems to us dangerous. But, if it is to be used at all, it should be on an absolutely impartial basis. So hurrah for Judge Guy! We hope he will be sustained by the upper courts.

Thanks to the vision and courage of the Congregationalists, a new mile-stone is set up on the road to church unity! On December 1st, there was published by the Commission on Unity of the Congregational churches of America, signed by Nehemiah Boynton, Newman Smyth, and Prof. Williston Walker, "a call for a covenent of church unity." This "call" sets forth the readiness of the members of the Commission to confer with representatives of any other churches "concerning realignment or unification of our respective forces and ministries." In justification of its appeal, the call reads in part:

At this time when the leading nations of the world are entering into a covenant of ten years for the readjustment of their military forces for the sake of keeping the peace of the world, shall not the churches of Christ do likewise? Shall the diplomats of the world be wiser for their generation than the leaders of the churches? Surely, this is no time for tarrying in theological consultations, or standing idly within ecclesiastical limitations. Now is the time for practical agreements and united action. Our spiritual unity needs to be made so visible that the man on the street may see it.

This declaration and invitation, sent forth into the Christian world by distinguished churchmen on behalf of a great Protestant communion, constitutes a remarkable challenge to the conscience of all American religionists. It is a gesture as dramatic, and at the same time as serious, as Secretary Hughes's announcement of his program for disarmament. It is now most decidedly "up" to the other denominations. Come, Unitarians, Universalists, Baptists, what are you going to do? Do you really care about "the church universal," of which you talk so much; or are you really concerned, after all, only with your own little denomination? Here, at last, is an acid test. How are you going to meet it?

Patriotism

Men have experimented largely in loyalties of various kinds, and their conclusions from experiment have been embodied in a long list of sayings, phrases, proverbs, and taboos. Thus, "To thine own self be true," "Blood is thicker than water," "Honor thy father and thy mother," "My country, right or wrong," "The world is my country," "Thou, oh Christ, art all I ask," "Thou shalt love the Lord, thy God, with all thy heart," "Him only shalt thou serve" and many more. Each has had its eloquent advocates, and each has them still; but among them one takes precedence today and is on every tongue, and it is called patriotism. Ku Klux Klans and Christians, American Legions and American Lyceums, Yellow Journals and White, and even those of the milder shades of pink, alike exalt and extol the love of country and are doubtful of larger loyalties.

All of us are more or less the slaves of our vocabularies. "Great is the power of words; they make things to be this way and that way." Just now with a Conference of Nations meeting to consider what's wrong with the world, and striving to set it right, is a good time to break with the tyranny of words and phrases and to get back to meanings. If we are to be true to our own selves, to what self shall we be true? Have we a single "own self"? Shall we "honor" a father or mother if they are not worthy of honor? and what is the test of worthiness if not merely the test of common blood? Shall it indeed be "My country, right or wrong"? and if so, does it mean a duty to go along, or a duty to oppose? What is involved in making Christ our one and only loyalty? What does it mean to serve God only? Here are enough questions for a volume in answers, but from among them the timely one is that which concerns the nature and quality of patriotism.

Meanings are elusive things—they change in our very grasp. Especially with charged or polarized words that have come to be saturated with human emotions the expression of our deepest convictions has a way of transforming itself so that we find ourselves committed to monstrosities we never dreamed of accepting. So as "patriots" we find ourselves involved in hatreds, in homicides, in the bearing of false witness, in all uncharitableness. "Love of country" somehow and without our knowledge is

found to mean the cancellation of our ideals, the denial of our religion, a reversal of all those values to which our lives have been dedicated. "Good citizenship" changes over night: whereas today it means to act on decisions rather than upon impulses; to maintain principles rather than to shout with mobs, tomorrow it means to go along with the noisiest shouters and to substitute catch words for ideas. Wherefore it seems worth while to set down some of the things that patriotism as a virtue is not, as a preliminary to determining what it is.

Patriotism is not in any literal sense an affair of a geographical area, which stops at rivers and imaginary lines. It is all right to

> . . . love thy rocks and rills,
> Thy woods and templed hills

but only as they are symbolic of the rocks, woods and hills of our world, and the rapturous thrills they yield to men. No doubt the exploiter of mines, oil wells and water power, and the wood butcher also love our rocks, rills, and woods, but they are not necessarily patriots. Neither is patriotism a love of a particular group of people marked or by location, by language, or by race, except in so far as these things bring them nearer together and so enable them to be of more use to each other. In the parable of the Good Samaritan it is set forth that the "neighbor" whom we must "love as ourselves," is the man whom we can best serve; and that man is, of course, one who is in some sense near to us. We owe more, quantitatively, to ourselves than to anyone else: eating, drinking, dressing, reading, working, sleeping, take a very large fraction of our time. So also we owe more in quantity to those of our families than to "outsiders," and to those of our country than to "foreigners." But this is only because ourselves, our family, our countrymen are our "neighbors"—because we can serve them more effectively, and through them can do the largest service to our fellow men. At any moment conditions may arise which make it necessary and our highest duty to sacrifice ourselves for family; or our family to country; or our country?— Here we pause. Shall we rather say, "Our country, right or wrong"? Yes!— cry the flag flappers, the patrioteers, the fliers of the eagle. It is hard to blame them. When one has accustomed himself to use words and phrases as if they were ideas, it is too much to expect that he will know when the meanings have evaporated and only the words are left. But in moments of sincerity, fighting off the tyranny of phrases, shall we not recognize it as a fact that our organized nation is just our contribution to the effort of mankind to work out a plan of living together? So our loyalty to country is secondary in value, though vastly larger in actual application, as compared with our duty to all fellow men, and whenever they clash the latter takes precedence. Our patriotism is due only to those institutions of our country which are good for humanity. We owe no loyalty to any attempt on the part of our nation to gain by the loss of another nation. Only those international relations are to be accepted which "bless him that gives and him that takes." Only those national policies may be approved by a genuine patriot which are in line with the common good.

We may now affirm that patriotism is "enthusiasm for the really great and admirable phases of the national life. Instead of a pride in the prowess of army and navy, of yachts or athletes, it should become a pride in national efficiency and health, in the national art, literature, statesmanship, and educational system, in the beauty of public buildings and the standards of public manners and morals."* And all these, be it remarked, are not only good for Americans but also for all those who come to us and all those to whom we go. But true patriotism must run beyond these phrases and have clear vision as to what the nation is to be "efficient" in doing, as to what our "educational systems" shall accomplish. Here we come to fundamentals, and here we reassert that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," that governments exist to see that people have the "inalienable rights of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness" in so far as these do not cross the like rights of others. And "life" means the "more abundant life" rather than mere existence—means leisure and culture, means books and travel, and friendships, and enthusiasms. "Liberty" is no abstraction and no mere negation. Freedom of our bodies from chains and prisons is not enough. We must have real freedom of expression in pulpit, forum and press: freedom to advocate the unpopular cause, to express the hated ideal, to speak folly as well as to speak wisdom. It is not "freedom" to be dependent on any dictator however benevolent for the privilege of working. It is not freedom to live under conditions which put in private hands the keys to opportunity and allow the holder of the keys to charge such prices of admission as he will. That man is not free to "pursue happiness" who must needs work twelve hours per day seven days in the week in order to hold his job; nor that one who lives under constant dread of unemployment. So that genuine patriotism must display itself in overturning systems, however time-honored, which involve suppression of opinion, over-speeding of industry, monopoly of opportunity. Our country is for man, not man for our country; wherefore any institution which aims to strengthen the nation at the expense of the freedom of people is a treasonable institution and should be suppressed. A party has reached the stage of treason when its party ends become to it more important than the welfare of people—and *people* does not mean only *voters*, nor only American people, but *people*.

Again it is people who are important rather than

*Drake—"Problems of Conduct."

property; wherefore we owe no loyalty to any property interests, "vested" or otherwise, unless they distinctly further human ends—life, liberty, happiness, growth. The man who regards any kind of property rights as valid for any other reason has lost his sense of proportion and has become blind to the very meanings of the property rights themselves.

And finally it is all people who are important, not white people, nor poor people, nor yellow people, nor blond people, nor strong people, nor cultured people, nor clever people, but people. Wherefore no government is to be justified or supported in playing a diplomatic game of chess to win from another nation. Our representatives in Washington meet the representatives of other nations not to match wits and defeat them, but to combine knowledge and wisdom in the effort to rescue humanity from the abyss to the edge of which it has been led. That "diplomat" who would play up his country at the expense of another is a traitor to humanity; if he is found trying to win for his people what must thereupon be lost by another he is a mere thief of the world. It is the duty of each by his special knowledge of his own countrymen to see that their needs are not ignored, but it equally is his duty to try to understand the needs of other people and to see that they are not exploited.

Our own country at this present crisis is in an unusual situation. When most of the world is in ruin we are essentially untouched: our resources, in spite of the wastes of war, have not been squandered; our young men, though tarnished by war spirit, are sterling metal on the whole and have escaped slaughter. Our debts sound enormous and in fact are beyond understanding, yet they represent only what all of us owe some of us. America felt only the breath of war, not its teeth and claws. Wherefore and because this is by no desert of ours, it is our duty to be not just but generous in our dealing with the other nations at the Conference table.

We, the people, who are carrying on negotiations in Washington through our representatives are really represented in every act of intelligent generosity on their part. We are willing and anxious to make greater sacrifices than others, to run greater risks, to carry heavier burdens, since they who are strong should bear the burdens of the weak. We are really represented too when our delegates stand firmly and unflinchingly against the fever and hysteria of those just emerged from the menace, or the actual presence of war. We desire no special privileges; we claim no "spheres of influence," and we refuse to play with pretty phrases like "white man's burden" as a basis for exploitation. We desire that the resources of our country shall be used in all friendliness to help other folk as they desire our help, and we pray for a humility that will guard us against the enforcing of our "help" upon those who do not desire it. Our delegates have done well in offering to sacrifice more in the way of battleships than they asked of others. Let them continue to do well by accepting every advance upon their offer on the part of others. Does England, accepting our proposals, advocate the elimination of submarines? By what possible pretense of "security" do we refuse? Does Haiti or the Philippines demand a hearing before an impartial tribunal? What does it imply if we decline to accede? Genuine patriots, loyal to ideals and not to mere phrases, desire an end of wars of aggression under the name of "defense," or of "protection." Genuine patriots desire that their country shall be a good neighbor to other nations, strong and weak.

Finally, if our "patriotism" takes its proper place and represents loyalty to our ideals in national affairs, the conflict with our religion, which makes the latter seem a pretense and a fraud, will come to an end. We can cease to lead a double life—good citizens among our fellow countrymen and potential criminals among all other people. As our personal interests sink into insignificance when our families are threatened, as our families must be neglected if our country needs us, so our country should take second place where its apparent interests conflict with those of the greater family, the human family. So only can we unify our lives and come into accord with the father of the human family and with our greater elder brother, Jesus.

JESSE H. HOLMES.

Abdul Baha

The death of Abdul Baha marks the passing of so great a religious leader, and brings into renewed prominence so important and beneficent a religious movement, that UNITY chooses to defer comment until one fully competent to speak can here bear witness. Not this week, therefore, but next week, and not by the Editors, but by Mr. Horace Holley, one of the leading Bahaists in this country, author of "The Modern Social Religion," "Bahai: The Spirit of the Age," and other widely-read books, will due tribute be paid to the career and teachings of Abdul Baha, and to the significance in our modern world of the religious movement to which he gave his life, in succession to and emulation of his immortal father, Baha O'llah.

Meanwhile, we must ourselves place on record in this place our profound reverence for this saintly soul who has just now passed into the great beyond. When we met him and heard him in 1912, we were impressed by certain very rare qualities of gentleness, patience, wisdom, "sweetness and light," rather than by any overshadowing power of personality or thought. When we have read his words in these later years we have

been moved by the simplicity, clear vision and august elevation of sentiment characteristic of a serene and lofty spirit, but have missed a certain originality and authentic sweep of spiritual genius which always seemed to us to be supremely evident in the utterances and writings of the great Baha O'llah.

But all reservations and questionings were silenced yesterday, as they are silenced today, by the contemplation of what this leader of a noble and emancipating religion paid willingly in bodily suffering, mental anguish and loss of personal liberty, for the faith that was within him. Abdul Baha is forever enrolled among the heroic and saintly martyrs of religious history! It was not given to him, as it was to his predecessors, to pay "the last full measure of devotion" —namely death; but he paid to the uttermost farthing that sometimes heavier and more terrible penalty of exile and prolonged imprisonment. Sixty years he was in banishment from his native land and people. Many of these years, he was in prison in one of the vilest pest-holes of the Turkish Empire. Only in the closing period of a lengthy life did he win, through sheer spiritual mastery of those who held him in confinement, freedom and contact with his followers throughout the world. History shows no braver or nobler suffering for a cause than this. Never once, even in his blackest hours, was Abdul Baha's soul clouded with fear or hate. He loved his enemies, prayed for them that despitefully persecuted him, overcame their evil with his good, and therewith in time overcame *them.* This heroic episode is a supreme example of what the spirit of man can do. Before such example, we stand dumb in reverence and awe. In thought of such sacrificial devotion, all questions as to the precise rating of the man in the scale of intellectual and spiritual genius, become ridiculous and impertinent. Abdul Baha led bravely and wisely through many years a religious movement of extreme beauty and beneficence, and must take, therefore, permanent place among the great religious leaders of all time.

In outlook, opinion and policy, Abdul Baha was one of the freest and most progressive of men. He seems to have been bound by none of the narrowing traditions of the Orient. More fully than any other Easterner we have ever met, his mind was a universal mind. He understood the brotherhood of man and taught it unflinchingly. He combated war with singular devotion, and strove earnestly and wholeheartedly for international organization and peace. He urged the emancipation of women, and sought everywhere to spread the enlightening influences of education. Especially did he seek the oneness of religion; the "Church of the Great Light," for which Bishop Nicolai, of Serbia, plead in these columns two weeks ago, is more fully and beautifully realized in Bahaism than in any other religious organization in America.

We mourn the passing of this illumined soul, and give to his life and memory our reverent salutation. We extend to the great and noble band of his followers in this country and throughout the world our sympathy in the loss of their adored leader. We beseech them to continue his work, to live ever in the spirit and truth of his saintly life, and therewith to bless mankind with the presence of "true religion and undefiled." JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

A HYMN OF PEACE.

To the Tune of "The Battle Hymn of the Republic."

Mine eyes have seen the glory of the day of Peace on Earth,
We have waited for the victory and the world's triumphant birth;
Into Freedom for all nations and good will to men on earth,
For God is marching on!

I have seen the manhood of the world of every race and creed,
Rise in righteous indignation at the Tyrant's bloody deed;
They have crushed the feudal monster, and
Right, not Might, will lead,
For God is marching on!

I have read the fateful sentence, "As ye sow so shall ye reap,"
And this mighty law of justice is eternal though we sleep.
Awake, arise! the dawn is here—all souls their vigils keep,
For God is marching on!

He has sounded forth the gospel of the Brotherhood of Man,
All for each and each for all, is the great almighty plan;
Each selfish interest and pursuit let every nation ban,
For God is marching on!

In the beauty, truth and wisdom of this love for all mankind,
Taught by Teachers in all ages, men their souls will surely find;
And long sought peace and harmony with all the nations bind,
For God is marching on!

—*Alvira Phelps Haagsma.*

The Wisdom of the Peoples

I.

MAXIMS OF GEORGE SAVILE, MARQUIS OF HALIFAX, 1693.

In Parliaments men wrangle in behalf of liberty that do as little care for it as they deserve it.

Explaining is generally half-confessing.

Men often mistake themselves, but they never forget themselves.

It is flattering some men to endure them.

Experience maketh more prophets than revelation.

The knowledge that is got without pains is kept without pleasure.

Men who borrow their opinions can never repay their debts.

A man that loveth himself right will do everything else right.

Men take more pains to hide than to mend themselves.

A man may dwell so long upon a thought that it may make him prisoner.

—*Selected by James Waldo Fawcett.*

Some Causes of Present-Day Unrest

My Country, 'tis of thee,
Sweet land of liberty,
Of thee I sing!

Land of Liberty? Not yet!

"I pledge allegiance to my Flag, and to the Republic for which it stands; one Nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Liberty and justice? Yes! But it is an ideal, as yet; not an accomplishment!

Every human being longs for liberty—freedom to live, responsibly, in accordance with the natural laws of one's own being, without external and artificial restraints. The orderly relationships of such free beings constitute justice.

No freedom, no progress! Without freedom there can be neither orderly nor just relations among men. Liberty must first be established. The history of mankind has been, for the most part, an age-long struggle for liberty.

For what avail the plough or sail,
Or land or life, if freedom fail?

Liberty, in its evolution, passes through three stages: religious liberty—freedom of worship and of conscience; civil liberty—the right of self-government through the ballot; and economic liberty—"freedom of contract and exchange." Religious and civil liberty have made some clear gains; but economic liberty is yet to be attained. The great struggle of mankind, in these modern times, is for freedom in production, freedom of contract, and freedom in exchange. Until men, everywhere, are free to produce useful things, and as freely exchange them for the products of other men there will be discontent, strife, war.

In the Western World, centuries were occupied in the struggle for religious liberty. Oppression caused the explosion of the Lutheran Reformation; and the bloody Thirty Years War, ending with the Peace of Westphalia, in 1648, laid the foundations for religious liberty. For centuries, also, men lived under civic conditions in which they had little control of their own government. The French Revolution opened the door to civil liberty in France. The Revolution in England, in the seventeenth century, guaranteed civil liberty to Englishmen. Civil liberty in America followed. The right to self-government is attained.

But neither religious nor civil liberty brought men economic freedom. The struggle for it opened in the nineteenth century; it will be the chief conflict among men in the twentieth century.

For the want of economic liberty, great inequality in the distribution of material wealth characterizes our time. This mal-distribution of wealth is the principle cause of present-day unrest; but this cause, itself, is an effect of a still deeper cause—the *absorption* of the *economic rent* of *land* by *private individuals*.

Wealth has its sources in land, labor, and capital. Land produces rent; labor produces wages; and capital produces interest. If fairly distributed, rent would go to the Community; wages, to Labor; interest, to Capital.

But, under our present laws, not only interest goes to Capital, i. e., to private individuals who invest in land, but, also, economic rent goes to Capital. And with what result? A most unequal distribution of wealth! And not only does Capital get its legitimate interest, and too much of the economic rent of land, but Capital also gets some of the wages that belong to Labor. Capital gets it by over-management (high salaries that are not necessary to effective management), by manipulations of stock in various ways, and sundry other methods that are not fair. Then, too, Labor has to pay out some of its wages in the form of taxes and rents to make up for the amounts that Capital took of the economic rent of land—rent that should have gone to the Community with which to meet the public expenses. By this very unequal distribution of wealth Labor is a heavy loser. No wonder that Labor is up in arms!

The real conflict in the economic warfare of our times should not be, primarily, between Capital and Labor, but should be waged between Capital and the Community. For, Capital is absorbing the economic rent of land that, really, belongs to the Community. And it follows that, in order to rectify the wrong, Labor should not fight Capital, single-handed, but ally itself with the Community, to compel, by just laws, Capital to give up its unearned and unjust accumulations of the economic rent of land. As long as Labor has to pay out, in taxes and rents, part of its wages to the Community, while, at the same time, Capital is continually absorbing wealth that belongs to the Community,—the economic rent of land,—Labor will be defeated. A violent and destructive Revolution would not help matters, permanently. Under any new regime, unless the economic rent of land went to the Community, the same troubles would arise again. Nothing but an alliance of Labor with the Community to reconstruct the present laws,—laws that, as now constituted, make possible the present-day unequal distribution of wealth,—can bring about justice and order and liberty among men. Capital, had it only its legitimate interest, would be, relatively, very weak; not at all able to impose the restrictions upon the development of economic liberty which, under present laws, it does impose. But Capital will remain over-dominant just as long as the Community is indifferent to its loss of economic rent, and Labor remains, seemingly, so unaware of the leakage which causes such unequal distribution of wealth. Labor, alone, is no match for Capital, so long as Capital takes to itself so much of the wealth that belongs to the Community. Let, however, Labor and the Community unite to rectify the laws, then, Capital will be reduced to its proper and beneficent place in the economic order of the world. The cause of economic liberty waits upon this union of Labor with the Community.

And it all comes back to the world-old question, that of LAND!

Settle the land-question,—then, the day of justice, equal distribution of wealth, and economic liberty among men will arrive; and not before!

Let us ask three questions:—

1st. What is land; and who owns it?

2d. Why private ownership of land; and the nature of that ownership?

3d. What is economic rent; and to whom does it belong?

1st. Land is the earth upon which all persons must live. Upon it they produce food, shelter, clothing, useful implements, literature, art, ideals; and they exchange these useful products with each other, giving rise to trade, banking, commerce.

This land, so necessary to all, belongs to no one person, or group of persons, seeing that men did not make the earth, but received it as a gift from Nature. Land, therefore, belongs to the Community.

2d. Why, then, if the land belongs to the Community, should there be private ownership of land? And, if private ownership of land is to continue, what is the nature of that ownership?

Land must be used productively in order to support the population living upon it. But to use land productively, Labor and Capital must be employed upon the land. Now, of course, nobody will invest his labor and capital upon land unless he be reasonably sure of sufficient *permanency of tenure of the land* to enable him to get his due wages for his labor and due interest for his capital invested. If a farmer, one-year rental is not enough time to rotate his crops and breed his animals; if city property, it takes, very often, many years to develop a good business at any given stand. Therefore, the user of land, whether rural or urban, must *own the land,* i. e., be guaranteed *perpetual permanency of tenure and the right to dispose of that tenure;* but, also, this user must be made to realize that this permanency of tenure is a *special privilege,* granted by the Community, and for that privilege the user should pay rent to the Community. There is not the slightest objection to private ownership of land, if this be the nature of it, and the understanding between both the user and the Community. Such private ownership is far better for all concerned than any sort of *tenancy,* whether derived from public or private landlords.

Hence, we have the seeming inconsistency of a public Landlord,—the Community,—and the private Landowner, the individual who uses the land! In short, land has *two* owners,—the Community and the private individual. The distinction between Landlord (The Community) and Land-owner (the private individual) must always be insisted upon; and kept in mind. It is vital to any clear understanding of the land-question!

Therefore, as wealth belongs to its creator, the economic rent of land belongs to *its creator,* the Community, the Public Landlord; but the produce of the land belongs to *its creators,* the Labor and Capital used to work the land, i. e., the Land-owner, or the tenant, if it be privately-hired land.

This double ownership of land has not been very clearly seen until recently. And the failure to make this distinction is one of the causes of the economic confusion so prevalent; until it is made clear, the confusion and its resulting mal-distribution of wealth will continue to cause unrest and strife among men.

Restated:—the Community is the natural Landlord to whom belongs the economic rent of the land; the private individual is (or ought to be) the Land-owner. Rent should go to the Community, and be used to pay the public expenses; the produce of the land should go to the Land-owner for his use and benefit.

As experience has proved that land cannot be made sufficiently productive under Community-use (Communism) to support the population living upon the land, the land, therefore, has been parcelled-out to private owners, who have been given title-deeds in fee simple, publicly-recorded, as evidence of the private individual's *permanency of tenure of the land, and the right to convey this permanency of tenure to buyer, or heirs and assigns forever.*

Land-ownership thus differs from all other property (wealth acquired by labor and capital); the Land-owner really owns, so far as land is concerned, only *permanency of tenure and negotiability of that tenure.* The Community that grants this permanency of tenure still, primarily, *owns the land;* and, as such owner, should receive its economic rent. For the private Land-owner to receive *both* the product of the land and its economic rent is, obviously, unfair; and it constitutes an unequal distribution of wealth.

3d. What is economic rent; and to whom does it belong? This has been answered, already, in part. It is the annual value of land (rent) that has been created by the Community moving upon the land. Ricardo stated the Law of Rent in a technical way not necessary to elaborate here. Suffice to say, the demand for the use of land creates rent just so soon as individuals begin to press upon the available supply of land. This rent belongs to the Community; and should be used by the Community to meet the expenses of such services as the Public renders to the individuals in the Community; i. e., the expenses of government.

This natural and legitimate income to the Community is always sufficient (except in times of crisis, such as war and the devastations of nature) to meet the charges for highway, police, schools, courts, etc. And it is much more than can be extracted, usually, from private individuals by the present methods of taxation. If the public revenue came from site-values of land (its economic rent), instead of from taxes upon the earnings of Labor and Capital, we should have better roads, better schools, and more effective public service in every particular. Human effort, thus relieved, would give rise to uninterrupted prosperity; and there could be no unequal distribution of wealth. For, as we have seen, wealth is derived from the rent of land, the wages of labor, and the interest on capital; and rent would go to the Community, wages to Labor, and interest to Capital in their just and equable proportions. The community would be prosperous; laborers would always have profitable work; and capitalists would always be able to invest their capital productively.

Does all this seem too good to be true? Well, settle the land-question justly; then, witness the result! All human material prosperity rests upon land-equity; as life, itself, depends upon the products of land. Furthermore, a just settlement of the land-question would put a stop, naturally, to destructive conflicts between Capital and Labor; for free land means economic freedom for all men. "Justice and liberty?" Ah, yes! Whenever we transmute good-will into daily habit!

Why not, then, the union of the Community (the Landlord), Labor (the wage-earner), and Capital (the earner of interest)? Would they not, standing back to back, and thus face front to Opportunity, bring in the reign of economic liberty and the unending prosperity of all mankind?

It is no dream, my brothers! Even now, it's only the little rift in the instrumentality of human harmony and co-operation that makes the music of mankind, for the time being, mute! And that little rift in the

present economic order,—or, rather, disorder,—is to be found in the mal-adjustments of land-holding, that give rise to inequity in the distribution of our material wealth. Free the land, by diverting its economic rent from private pockets to the treasury of the Community,—then, you free humanity, and establish economic liberty that shall forever endure, side by side, with religious and civil liberty!

Transmute, my brothers, transmute ethical justice into economic practice in this Nation of ours! Yes, that's the call of suffering humanity!

"Wist ye not that we must be about our Father's business?" Yea! And the "King's business requireth haste!"

A. W. Littlefield.

Middleborough, Massachusetts.

Concerning Prisons and Punishments

A course of incarceration in prison or in the penitentiary is the best antidote that I know of for the comfortable illusion which regards this as the best of all possible worlds, a world governed by ideas of justice and of right rather than by hypocrisy and violence. The perspective of human dishonesty and cruelty and faithlessness which is there revealed to the incredulous gaze of Innocence Confined is at first so bewildering and at last so horrifying that, were it not for a merciful remnant of a sense of humor and a reviving spark of creative aspiration, those who endured it for the sake of conviction during the war-period would have long ago surrendered to an utter cynicism or an abiding misanthropy which would prefer the company of animals of the field or the rhythmic silences of nature to the society of men.

It is not until the sting and suffocation and maddening suppression of prison life yield under the subtle influence of Time that the ruthlessness and duplicity of wardens and "stool-pigeons" and the incessant invisible warfare, more cruel than that of the wolf-pack, whose existence make prisons the hells that they are, where all the pettiness and dishonesty and meanness of the world seem to be concentrated and intensified beyond description,—it is only when these bitter memories have been softened by the passage of time that those who possess them can recall them or discuss the circumstances which created them with any degree of patience or equanimity.

Gradually it becomes clear that prisons and the prison-system, by which large groups of human beings are punished and exploited by small ones, exist because of an amazing general ignorance concerning human nature and concerning the things which happen to human nature when it is confined and suppressed and placed at the mercy of prison-keepers and the armed agents of the law. It becomes equally clear that, like almost everything else in society, prisons exist as much because the economic interests of certain influential people make those people desire them to exist as because of any moral force in the world, although they are always sustained and justified by various moral theories and assumptions.

There are two "moral" theories, to be exact, by which prisons are maintained and defended. The first is the theory of Free-Will and the second is its natural corrollary, the theory of punishment. The theory of free-will holds, to put it briefly, that every individual is "the architect of his own destiny," a free moral agent, a being free to act as he will for good or evil and therefore deserving to be held to a strict accountability for his acts and for their moral consequences. It is a theory that flourished easily in a period of economic individualism and of extraordinary economic opportunities. It is a remnant, in my judgment an unscientific and erroneous remnant, of Puritanism—a theory that has done vastly more harm than good in the world. It has been the bulwark of legal barbarities and religious tyrannies and frauds for centuries; in its name atrocious cruelties have been inflicted upon the invalid and the weak, the young and the delinquent, the indigent and the insane. It is universally recognized that very young children are not responsible for their behavior. At just what period, then, in the life of a man does he become a sovereign moral agent individually responsible for all of his acts? At eighteen, or twenty-one? Who can say? It is a matter, not of years but purely of education.

A man is the sum of his experiences touched, sometimes, with a spark of aspiration—of experiences which themselves are the products of the complicated interaction of environmental influences and hereditary traits. His education may have been carefully supervised and consciously directed by parents and teachers, in which case he is likely to become a law-abiding and useful citizen—but far more frequently his education is a matter of accident rather than design, or it is neglected altogether. How, in such an event, can an individual be blamed for "going wrong"? Yet he is in fact not only blamed for it by citizens and judges but he is sent to prison with others of his kind to "pay a debt to society." The debt, in fact, is more probably upon the other side.

An astonishingly small percentage of human conduct is deliberative or rational or in any true sense dictated by ideas—so small, indeed, that a man who attempts to act upon principle or rational theory, in war time particularly, is almost certain to be regarded as a fit subject for an asylum or a penitentiary. And of that small percentage of conduct in which reason appears to operate to select a given course among a number of possible alternatives, the choice which is made is determined in advance by the temperament and education, i. e., the instincts and accumulated personal experiences of the individual agent. In a word, when men choose deliberately they do so under what might be called a compulsion of inevitable choice, and when they do not choose rationally or deliberately they are the creatures of undisciplined instincts and untrained emotions, or of their instinctive and emotional prejudices, to be studied and commiserated with and taught rather than condemned. This, I believe, was the true meaning of Jesus Christ when he said: "Judge not, that ye be not judged!" He was condemning the moralistic attitude and the Theory of Free-Will. Certainly the obsession that men are wilful saints or sinners—free moral agents acting in some kind of a social vacuum for good or evil, as they will, —is an uncritical, unscientific, Puritanical barbarism verging on a monstrosity!

The second theory by which prisons and penitentiaries and our whole machinery of injustice is maintained is the theory of punishment. By it we deliver into the hands of professional torturers men and women who are convicted, often by ignorant and prejudiced juries, not necessarily of crime in the moral sense, but of some violation of law, regardless of

whether the act for which they have been convicted be evil or not, and equally regardless of whether the individual be responsible or not and of whether the punishment will do him any good or not. It is simply a case of revenge—that is the only way it can be explained—revenge taken by the agents of society upon the offending individual. Now punishment may, on rare occasions, be useful in the correction of a naughty child, provided always that the child understands why it is being punished. But does anyone who knows aught of life really believe for a moment to-day that the infliction of pain by one adult human being upon another awakens in the latter anything but hatred and rebellion, achieves anything but malignance and contumacy and spiritual debasement all around? If there be anyone who does, I invite him to go to prison and see for himself. He will find, as I have found, that the theory of punishment is a rank and stupid fallacy that fails miserably to do what it is intended to do. Jails and prisons and penitentiaries do not reform. They do not make useful citizens out of bad ones; they breed crime. They corrupt and embitter and degrade, both officers and inmates; they intensify the selfishness and ignorance which they are designed, or believed to be designed, to reform. They are, I am convinced, worse than useless as they exist to-day. It is useful to recall the words of Lester F. Ward, one of the great thinkers of America:—"Just as men imagine that they would commit crime but for certain Governmental restraints, so they think they would do wrong but for religiouus restraints when in fact they would do just the same as now, if neither existed."

The men who direct and supervise the establishments in which we confine our offenders are, with few exceptions, totally unfit for the responsibility. They are generally without scientific training of any kind and are without interest in the men over whom they have virtually power of life and death, save an economic interest in their exploitation or something worse—a sadistic interest in their torture. They are often much inferior intellectually and morally to their slaves. Generally speaking, prisoners in our penitentiaries have nothing but contempt for their masters and wardens; how could it be otherwise? The penitentiary at Leavenworth is a palace of corruption and human degeneracy which costs the tax-payers of the United States something more than a million dollars every year to maintain. It is an institution so designed and so administered that, I firmly believe, a long course of confinement in it would make a sneak-thief of St. Peter and a confidence man or worse of the Angel Gabriel!

There is no attempt at study or scientific classification of the prisoners there, no psychiatric or correctional medical work of any kind. A prisoner who seeks to maintain his dignity by refusing to become a "stool-pigeon" (this is called "refusal to co-operate with the authorities"!) may virtually abandon hope of winning a parole because the granting of parole is in the hands of the local officials—the Warden, the Doctor, and often the Chief Clerk, composing the Parole Board, together with one official from the Department of Justice in Washington. Recently a rule has been introduced to the effect that a prisoner may not even appear before the parole board if he has been reported for any infraction of rule within six months prior to the meeting of the board. Inasmuch as a guard can report—and can be instructed to report—a prisoner at any time for the most trivial offense, as, for instance, that of standing out of place in line, any prisoner can be disbarred from parole indefinitely, if the local officials so desire. This neat arrangement, together with the small number of men who have been paroled in the last few years and the known corruption in the enforcement of the Parole Law, is the reason why a bill has been introduced in Congress providing for the automatic parole of first-offenders at the expiration of one-third of their sentences.

The treatment of the political prisoners whom the war has sent to the penitentiary is the same as that of the ordinary "criminal" save that, on the whole, he gets distinctly the worst of it. Villified by the controlled newspapers and being in a tiny minority, without the gang protection and means of communication with the outside world that habitués of the underworld possess, he is exposed to the unscrupulous intrigues of "stool-pigeons" and provocateurs and victimized by his own naïveté and ignorance of the ways of the underworld and of prisons which, in their psychology and atmosphere, at least, are a part of it. The political prisoner is regarded as either a freak fit for an asylum or some sort of a camouflaged "crook"—"criminals at heart and nuts" the Deputy-Warden at Leavenworth calls them—who doesn't "fit in." Most of them, to their credit be it said, do not try to "fit in", in the sense of playing the degraded prison game. It is a deep disgrace that prisoners of this type should be detained in the penitentiaries by a nation which regards itself as enlightened and liberal.

I have referred to the theories by which prisons are maintained and to some of the abuses which accompany their maintenance. It is supposed that prisons protect society. The truth is that they poison society. Neither the presence of prisons nor of the death penalty protect society from crime and the reason why our prisons and penitentiaries are the miserable failures that they are is not merely because they aim to punish rather than to reform, nor because they are directed and controlled by politicians for politicians instead of by scientists for society. These evils might be corrected if an aroused public opinion demanded it. The ultimate reason for their failure lies in the corruption and dishonesty which pervades our entire machinery of government and which is expressed strikingly in the remark, often heard at Leavenworth, that a man who steals a mail-pouch is sent to the penitentiary while a man who steals and loots a railroad or an entire system of railroads is sent to the Senate!

I am informed not only that nearly 500,000 men and women leave our jails and penitentiaries every year but that over 80 per cent of the offenses for which these men and women are incarcerated are offenses against private property. For this the gross and shocking inequalities in the distribution of wealth are, undeniably, largely responsible.

It is easy enough to say with the more extreme Socialists or Communists, for instance, that if one would abolish crime and criminals and prisons one has only to abolish private property—but to say so is no more relevant to the solution of our practical and pressing problem than to say, for instance, that "Money is the root of all evil" and rest content with saying so. Both statements are true enough in their way. Private property is, however, one of the oldest of human institutions and while private ownership of essentially

public services and resources will, I believe, be gradually extinguished, private property in some form, probably in many forms, will remain. And therefore it is reasonable to suppose that offenses against private property, as well as other offenses, will continue. Thus it is that, whether one is a capitalist or a "prowling terrier," an individualist or a communist, one must face as a citizen the challenge which prisons make and endeavor to find a solution for the accusing fact and prevalence of crime—a fact which is a constant menace to the success of organized society and government, and to the success of popular government in particular.

What the solution may be I shall not attempt to outline at this time. But, in approaching this perennial and often baffling problem, nothing seems to me so important as to hold steadily to the conviction, tested and sustained by observation and actual experience, that men and women are seldom, if ever, to blame for being what they are, that they act nine times out of ten, and perhaps ten times out of ten, in the only way they know how to act, and that punishing them will never alter their characters or their conduct for the better. Muscle cannot do the work of mind and not until the mind of the offender is reached and quickened with transformed desire will the man be changed.

Vienna, Austria. BRENT DOW ALLINSON.

The New Skepticism

The old orthodoxy set up an impossible supra-deity and insisted that all men worship him. But a wholesome skepticism turned them away from this celestial deity to find a divine world of law and order sufficient unto itself. Then they began to say, "There is but one God—'Law.' Him only shalt thou worship."

Thus did they fall into an idolatry as vain as that of the orthodox religionist before, as vain as that of the superstitious savage first of all. Putting away the anthropomorphic God, they set up an abstraction in His place.

And what an empty abstraction it is—a new God as impotent and unreal as the old God. Law? Law is only a method. It produces nothing, brings nothing to pass. It is not a cause of anything. It is only a behavior, a mode of performance. Aliveness, function, creation, genius, love—are according to law, but not solely because of law.

There is something in this world more vital and effective than law, more free and spontaneous, more spiritual and material, more personal than law. We know it when we hear a song, when we look into each other's eyes, when we create something. The abstract God, "Law," must go, along with the other deities. There is something yet truer, nobler than them all. Theologies have only touched the hem of the garments of God.

HUGH ROBERT ORR.

THE PUZZLED GAME BIRDS.

They are not those who used to feed us
When we were young—they cannot be—
These shapes that now bereave and bleed us?
They are not those who used to feed us,—
For would they not fair terms concede us?
—If Hearts can house such treachery
They are not those who used to feed us
When we were young—they cannot be!

—*Thomas Hardy.*

THE STUDY TABLE

New Books in Science

None of the entomological souvenirs of Fabre is more interesting than this new volume* proves to be. An unusual number of its curious and interesting facts relate to food and feeding. Three of them are really startling. The hunting wasps provide animal food for their young grubs. The victim is stung so as to produce either paralysis or death. Each genus selects its special prey, perhaps a single species, perhaps a group of kindred species. Each has its own method of attack, wonderful in its precision and accuracy, but varying with the anatomy of the victim. It may be a single thrust to the concentration of ganglia below, or a trio of thrusts, one to a center that controls the defence weapons of the prey and then two more near together far behind to paralyze the movement control, or a series of thrusts at regular intervals, each striking a segmental ganglion. Whether paralysis or death is sought depends somewhat upon the size of the food creature. Thus the *scolia* paralyzes a large beetle larva. The effect is produced by a single thrust aimed at the one vulnerable point, at the under part of the neck; just below it are grouped all the ganglia, and the unfortunate creature is completely paralyzed, though it still lives. The wasp then lays its egg on the under side of the abdomen of the victim. The flesh does not putrify, as the creature is paralyzed, not dead. The young *scolia* pursues a cautious course of feeding, eating the different tissues in definite order and leaving the nerves until the last, when it has fully made its own growth; then only does it attack these, killing its host. "The *scolia* is gifted with a special art of eating, an exquisitely delicate art, which saves a remnant of life in the prey until it is all consumed." Should any mistake be made the young *scolia* pays the penalty. An error on the part of the mother that would kill the food animal would result in putrefaction of the flesh and death to the eater; a mistake in its mode of eating would bring about the same result and the young *scolia* would die of ptomaine poisoning. Incidentally, in another connection, Fabre brings out a curious difference between vegetable and animal food. Plant-eating larvae eat one kind of plant food; they die if they cannot get it, no matter how near a substitute may be provided. In nature, the hunting wasps provide one food for the young; it may be a single species, or a group of related species. But, by experiment, Fabre shows that the carnivorous grub *can* vary his diet; other food in variety may be offered and will be eaten with the same avidity and profit as the food provided by the mother. The fact suggests some interesting observations. A third interesting fact regarding food and feeding relates to food rationing and sex. Many of the hunting wasps vary the amount of food provided for the young. Thus *philanthus* stocks the cell in which its egg is laid with from one to six bees; *tachytes* places from three to sixteen mantids in its cell; other genera similarly vary. So, too, *osmia* (a bee, not a hunting wasp), stores much more pollen food in some of its cells than in others. In all these cases, the scantly supplied cells produce males, those well supplied produce females. Yet the food is

*"More Hunting Wasps." J. Henri Fabre. New York: 1921. Dodd, Mead & Co. 16°, pp. (vii) 376.

stored before the egg is laid! Is the egg then neuter, and does the sex depend upon the amount of food? Fabre shows, along two lines of proof, that such is not the case. Experimenting directly upon *osmia,* he puts more food into the scantly supplied cells, removes some from the others. Yet the male egg produces a male and food is left uneaten; the female egg produces a female, stunted from under-nourishment, or the grub dies of starvation. The same appears to be true of the hunting-wasps. Fabre's second line of demonstration is from observing parasites. This trio of facts regarding food and feeding—the danger of ptomaine-poisoning, the difference between vegetable and animal food, and the relation of sex to ration—suggest how full of interest the book is.

As usual Fabre taunts the Darwinist with his helplessness in the presence of insect instincts. "The surgical art of *tachytes* is not an acquired art. Whence then does it come, if not from the universal knowledge in which all things move and have their being?" ". . . really, if we go to the bottom of things, we know nothing about anything. Scientifically speaking, nature is a riddle to which human curiosity finds no definite solution. Hypothesis follows hypothesis; the theoretical rubbish heap grows bigger and bigger, and still truth escapes us." As usual, he leaves us helpless in the presence of apparently purposeless automata.

Huntington's "Principles of Human Geography"† is the first serious American text in its field. The author is already known for important contributions to geographical science, particularly in the field of climatology. Here he studies all the elements in which nature is related to man. The differences which man presents in different places "are the subject matter of human geography." Human geography "is the study of the relation of geographical environment to human activities." The author considers man's relations to physical conditions and to life. Under the term physical conditions, he includes location, land forms, bodies of water, soils and minerals, climate; under life, he includes plants, animals, man. He studies each of these in detail and examines the human response. In connection with each section of the discussion a series of specific problems is presented for the student to solve. These differ in character and in difficulty. Some are general and comprehensive; others are specific and precise. The book is a text book, rather than a reading book, and it aims constantly at the practical. It is not always easy to see for what grade of students it is intended. Presumably it is for colleges and normal-schools, but its efforts at simplification sometimes fall below high-school intelligence. Thus, students qualified to take up this book as a text surely do not need the "ladders to illustrate latitude and longitude" and it is doubtful whether children of grammar-school grade would be aided by the illustration. There are other cases of overdone simplification. The book is abundantly illustrated—many of the illustrations being instructive; some of them seem to have been introduced simply because attractive pictures were available, rather than because they were pertinent. The captions to the pictures are often trivial and exasperating. Thus under number 62 we read—"showing cars in a coal mine—a hard, disagreeable job," and under number 49—"a steam hammer forging a steel axle for a railroad car. The kind of work that makes the steel age possible." Are either of these pictures particularly useful; and are the captions suited to the probable students of this book? However, we do not wish to be ill-natured. The book is a good one in an important field. It will get work from the student and will arouse enthusiasms for independent investigation and research.

Under the same title as Huntington's book is Brunhes' work.‡ It is strikingly different in arrangement and presentation. It is a pleasanter book to read, having a good literary style. It is, in fact, meant as a reading book as well as a text book. It has had a good reception in France, receiving the gold medal of the Paris Geographical Society and a prize from the French Academy. It has gone through two French editions and it has had a trio of well known American scholars to translate and edit it. Brunhes defines the field of human geography as "a double zone: the lower zone of the atmosphere surrounding our earth and the superficial zone of the solid crust." It is only at the surface where these two zones come in contact that human geography exists. Brunhes limits his subject as rigidly as he does its field. He refuses to be drawn into side issues, however interesting and attractive. He says:

> Human geography is first of all geography, and not psychology, sociology, or history. In the formative stage of its development, human geography was easily diverted from its proper field and thoughtlessly confused with the many other sciences dealing with man. It was easily accused, and not without reason, of "touching everything" without having a definite field and an organizing principle of its own.

Time and again our author emphasizes the fact that we are dealing with surface phenomena and that we are most concerned with those definite marks of his activity that man leaves upon the earth. What is man doing, what has he done, that leaves such a mark upon the globe that we cannot study it without seeing the impress? "Human geography is above all the geography of material human works; it is also the geography of human masses and of human races, but only in so far as these masses and these races express their specific and distinctive modes of activity by material works, and in so far as they reveal their existence and their presence by these same works." Brunhes recognizes six types of fundamental facts of human geography: 1. Facts of the unproductive occupation of the soil (a) houses, (b) roads; 2. facts of plant and animal conquest (c) cultivated fields, (d) domesticated animals; 3. facts of destructive economy (e) exploitation of minerals, (f) devastation of plant and animal life. The greater part of his book is devoted to the examination of these six types of facts. All of these leave a definite, evident, material, impress on the earth itself. The author then passes to a study of "islands," of which he recognizes five kinds—the islands of the sea, the islands of the desert (oases), the islands of the forest, the islands of mountain regions (high, closed valleys) and the islands of the plain (isolated, mountain areas). These isolated areas are studied to get clear pictures in mind; the elements discovered in their study may be afterward recognized and appreciated in larger, non-isolated stretches. In concluding chapters—*Beyond the Essential Facts* and *The Geographical Spirit,* Brunhes shows how far abroad the human geographer may legitimately range and argues that all kinds of investigations, physical, biological, and human, may draw upon geography or

†"Principles of Human Geography." Ellsworth Huntington and Sumner W. Cushing. New York: 1921. John Wiley & Sons. 8°, pp. (xiv) 430.

‡"Human Geography." Jean Brunhes. Chicago and New York: 1920. Rand, McNally & Co. 8°, pp. (xvi) 648.

THE FIELD.

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

A LETTER FROM BUDA-PEST.

"With the coming of the real winter we are face to face with living problems which owing to the present unrest and lack of peace we seem unable to solve. Relief Missions and charitable institutions are only means to tide over a difficult time and to meet unexpected emergencies, but alas they are becoming a part of a city's life. The real remedy lies in the bettering of the individual and economic conditions, and in the fixing of the valuta. Still in Central Europe we who are doing relief work, and had hoped things would improve during the recent summer, can only see a much harder winter, with greater distress and suffering. Here there is increasing unemployment, and rapidly falling valuta and a rapidly rising cost of food, clothes, etc., a great number of sick children, and as far as our Anglo-Hungarian Anti-Tuberculosis Committee's action is concerned it is amazing to have so many people, young and old, coming here for letters of recommendation to Dispensary or Sanitorium. Owing to the wretched housing conditions of the workers here, and the consequent overcrowding, the badly heated rooms due to the high price of coal and wood, to the lack of underclothing, and the Winter's wet and cold, one cannot foretell what these coming months will mean to thousands of human beings who only want honorable work and honest pay.

"In spite of all these hardships, it is good to think that the various foreign Missions are able to relieve a little of the distress and suffering, and to meet the present emergency, though the longer one is here the more one feels the whole trouble lies with the Supreme Council at Paris and the reconsideration of the Peace Treaty. We have very varied problems here; Hungarian refugees from Transylvania, Jugo-Slavia, Czecho-Slovakia, though very few fresh families come now except from West Hungary; refugees from Russia including officers of Wrangel's army, and women and children who have fled from the dread of famine, and even we have women and children who have been deserted by Hungarian soldiers who married when prisoners of war. Many of these Russian born women and their children have been sent to their native place, and our Mission is helping with food those who still remain.

"The great excitement over the King Karl question has passed over and it was sad to find a city divided against itself and to have to mourn the death of some few university students as well as soldiers. We have also interned in the neighborhood some of the Karlist soldiers. One never knows here when the next great excitement will begin, for there is much unrest in the political world. At the present moment we are waiting for the formation of a new cabinet.

"Amid all these stirring questions, it is a great relief to go to the Opera House, and this year the whole Orchestra and chorus have wonderfully improved, and oftentimes I feel our Buda-Pest Opera is a close rival with the Vienna Opera. All kinds of amusing incidents occur to brighten life and last week our British Consul sent me here a South African negro, aged about 23 years. He badly needed clothing in order that he might get work in a cafe, so I dressed him up from our Friends' warehouse and turned him out a "howling swell." The Consulate wrote and said that the negro had called and looked very elegant, and added "Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like this man!" The joy of the youth and his intense happiness when he returned to say he had got work was inspiring.

"The weather has been very cold but as this hotel has central heating one does not suffer at all though here the frost is very severe.

"There seems plenty of food in the city for those who can afford to buy it, but this is the case in all countries, and as in Vienna, there are great extremes of poverty and luxury, of underfeeding and overfeeding, of want and extravagance, of despair and pleasure.

"The valuta which in May and June stood at about 600 kronen to the English pound had fallen to 4,900 kronen last week and curiously enough today is about 4,000 kronen. With this constantly varying valuta no one can buy and no one can sell in the industrial world."

FRED HANKINSON.

SAVE THE RUSSIAN CHILDREN!

UNITY is receiving many requests to give publicity to the pressing need in Russia.

A cablegram from Colonel Haskell to Herbert Hoover reads:

"Notwithstanding gigantic American Relief operations already under way millions of Christian people in Russia face certain death by starvation before 1922 harvest unless material outside assistance is forthcoming. Even now the daily mortality is great and it will rapidly increase as winter advances. Any charity that can be given will be so distributed

HOLMES' ENGAGEMENT CALENDAR

(Compiled by Mrs. Holmes)

12 Hymns by John Haynes Holmes, with space for engagements and photograph on cover

75 cents, postpaid; two copies for $1.00

From Miss Gertrude Herrmann, 23 West 127th Street New York City

Proceeds for the Building Fund of the Community Church of New York

THE DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE AT WASHINGTON WILL BE A FAILURE

Only by the Abolition of Neutrality Can War Be Quickly and Forever Prevented

A Monograph

By Luigi Carnovale, Author of "Why Italy Entered Into the Great War," Etc.

Price 25 Cents

ITALIAN-AMERICAN PUBLISHING COMPANY

Room 930, 30 N. Michigan Avenue CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

inter-relate with it. Brunhes draws his specific data almost entirely from his own experience and goes little outside of Europe and the Mediterranean area. His illustrations are largely from his own negatives. The result is not, as might have been expected, a cramped and narrow treatment. He has, rather, a remarkable opportunity to show how the world may really be studied and explained from one's own doorsteps. The editors have, however, reacted a little against his position and method in preparing the book for American use, replacing his chapter vii, which was a study of the Val d'Anniviers by a study of the Central Andes. It will be seen that Brunhes' book is exceptional in its point of view and original in its treatment.

FREDERICK STARR.

that the maximum number of human lives will be saved. The Russian peasant surrounded by his family calmly contemplates the inevitable while cherishing the vague idea that America may yet find the way to save them."

The Churches of America, acting through the Federal Council, are undertaking to do their full part in answering the cry of suffering humanity.

The American Relief Administration is giving 1,200,000 childen of Russia one free balanced meal a day, as well as supplying clothing and medical care, and the American Friends Service Committee (Quaker) is caring for 50,000. 3,000,000 more children in Russia face starvation this winter unless aid comes to them. Fifteen dollars ($15.00) will provide for one of these helpless Russian children through next summer. *Will You Answer This Challenge to Our Christian Civilization?*

Make checks payable to
HON. CARL E. MILLIKEN, *Treasurer,*
Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America
105 East 22nd Street, New York City.

The Friends of Soviet Russia, in response to a call to the workers of the world, have already raised $250,000. Famine relief campaigns have been organized in all parts of the United States, Canada and Cuba.

Send money, food, clothing, medicines to Friends of Soviet Russia, 201 West 13th Street, New York City. Dr. Jacob W. Hartmann, Treasurer.

Subscribe for UNITY —Do it Now!

DUTY TO CIVILIZATION

A Pamphlet answering many questions as to the causes of the Great War, written by FRANCIS NEILSON, author of "How Diplomats Make War," etc., Editor of THE FREEMAN and Associate Editor of UNITY.

This pamphlet will appeal to all those who believe the true history of the war and its causes is yet to be written, and that it is essential to the best development of our civilization.

Published by the
UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY
Price, 30 Cents 700 Oakwood Boulevard, CHICAGO
Reprinted from UNITY

Bowman Dairy Company

MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY

Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk

DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?

4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices
EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK

WRIGHT & COMPANY
STEAM—DOMESTIC
COAL
TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Schumann & Company

Cleaners of

FANCY GOWNS AND KID GLOVES

Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth

PHONE DREXEL 221
ALL DEPARTMENTS

MAIN OFFICE AND WORK:
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

The Tenant Farmer

In its February issue will contain an article on "Why Abraham Lincoln Rejected Christianity."

A paper published monthly. 25c a year. Room 414, 35 S. Dearborn St. Chicago

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.
PRINTERS and BINDERS
Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO